

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

CORE WIRELESS LICENSING	§	
S.A.R.L.,	§	Case No. 2:14-cv-911-JRG-RSP
	§	(lead)
v.	§	
	§	Case No. 2:14-cv-912-JRG-RSP
LG ELECTRONICS, INC., AND LG	§	
ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM	§	
U.S.A., INC.	§	

ORDER

Before the Court are Defendants’ Objections to Magistrate Judge Payne’s Claim Construction Orders for the Group 1, Group 2, and Group 3 Patents (“Defendants’ Objections”) (Dkt. Nos. 258, 260, 267) and Plaintiff’s Objections to Magistrate Judge Payne’s Claim Construction Orders for the Group 1, Group 2, and Group 3 Patents (“Plaintiff’s Objections”) (Dkt. Nos. 261, 262, 265). In the Magistrate Judge’s Claim Construction Orders (“Claim Construction Orders”) (Dkt. Nos. 246, 247, 251), the Magistrate Judge construed certain claim terms of United States Patent Nos. 5,907,823; 5,946,634; 6,266,321; 6,477,151; 6,633,536; 6,978,143; 7,072,667; 7,383,022; 7,599,664; 7,782,818; 7,804,850; 8,165,049; 8,434,020; 8,498,671; 8,713,476; 8,792,398; and RE44,828.


In their objections, Defendants object to the Court’s decision not to construe terms identified only by Apple (no longer a party), but not by LG, in the parties’ joint claim construction charts. Defendants also object to the Court’s constructions of several terms, re-urging only the arguments previously raised in their claim construction briefs. In its objections, Plaintiff objects to the Court’s constructions of several terms, and likewise re-urges only the arguments it previously raised in its claim construction briefs.

Upon review of the parties' objections, this Court observes that the Magistrate Judge's Claim Construction Orders properly construed these terms. Because the findings of the Magistrate Judge were neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to the law, the Court need not modify or set aside any part of the Claim Construction Orders in light of the parties' objections. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(a).

After reviewing Plaintiff's Objections and Defendants' Objections, and finding no part of the Claim Construction Orders to be "clearly erroneous or contrary to law,"¹ both Plaintiff's and Defendants' Objections to the Claim Construction Orders are **DENIED**.

So Ordered this

Mar 20, 2016



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(a).